

The Later Mughals (1707–1803).—By WILLIAM IRVINE, Bengal Civil Service. (Retired).

In continuation of the articles in Part I of the *Journal* for 1896, Vol. LXV, pp. 136–212, and 1898, Vol. LXVII, pp. 141–66.

Table of Contents.

CHAPTER IV.—FARRUKHSIYAR (*continued*).

- Section 12. The state of parties at Court.
- „ 13. Severities inflicted at the instigation of Mir Jumlah (March 1713—April 1714).
- „ 14. First quarrel with the Sayyads (April 1713).
- „ 15. Campaign against Rājah Ajit Singh, Rāhtor (Nov. 1713—July 1714).
- „ 16. Renewal of quarrel with the Sayyads (September–December 1714).
- „ 17. Farrukhsiyar's marriage to Ajit Singh's daughter (May–December 1715).
- „ 18. Fight between the retainers of Muḥammad Amin Khān and Khān Daurān (April 21st, 1716).

SECTION 12. THE STATE OF PARTIES AT COURT.

The names, Mughal, Turānī, and Irānī, appear so frequently in our narrative, and so much turns upon the relation to each other of the various groups into which the army and officials were divided, that a few words of explanation will be necessary for a clear understanding of what follows. Ever since the Mahomedan conquest of India, adventurers from the countries to the west and north-west flocked into it as to a Promised Land, a land flowing with milk and honey. The establishment of a dynasty, of which the founder, Bābar, was a native of Trans-Oxiana, gave a further stimulus to this exodus into India, where fighting men from the fatherland of the imperial house were always welcome. They formed the backbone of the army of occupation. Their

numbers were increased still further during the twenty-five years or more, from 1680 to 1707, during which 'Ālamgīr waged incessant war in the Dakhin, first with the local Mahomedan states and then with the Mahrattahs.

These foreigners, at least the greater number of them, were either Afghāns or Mughals; if the latter, they were known as either Turānī or Irānī Mughals. In using this term Mughal, I vouch in no way for its accurate application, ethnographically or otherwise. It must be understood to be an unquestioning acceptance of the term as employed by Indian writers of the period. Every man from beyond the Oxus or from any of the provinces of the Persian kingdom was to them a Mughal. If his home was in Turān, north of the Oxus, he was a Turānī; if south of it, in the region of Irān, he was an Irānī Mughal. The Turānīs were of the Sunni sect, the prevalent belief of Mahomedan India, and came from the old home of the reigning dynasty. For these reasons, they were highly favoured by the Indian emperors, and owing to their great numbers and the ability, military and civil, of their leaders, formed a very powerful body both in the army and the state generally. The Irānīs were Shi'ās and were not so numerous as the Turānīs; yet they included among them men of good birth and great ability, who attained to the highest positions, many of the chief posts in the State having been filled by them. Shīrāz, in the Persian province of Fārs, furnished much the largest number of these Persians; most of the best physicians, poets, and men learned in the law came from that town. Owing to the difference of religion, principally, there was a strong feeling of animosity, ever ready to spring into active operation, between the Turānīs and the Irānīs; but as against the Hindūstānīs the two sections were always ready to combine.

Men from the region between the Indus on the east, and Kābul and Qandahār on the west, were called Afghāns. Those from the nearer hills, south-west of Peshāwar, are sometimes distinguished by the epithet *Rohelāh*, or Hill-man. But Indian writers of the eighteenth century never use the word Pathān, nor in their writings is there anything to bear out the theory that the Afghān and the Pathān are two different races.¹ The part of the Afghān country lying nearest the Indus furnished the majority of the Afghān soldiers who resorted to India; and, as might be expected from their comparative nearness to India, they probably outnumbered the Mughals. In any case, they seem to have had a talent for forming permanent settlements in India, which neither the Mughal nor the Persian has displayed. All over Northern India, Pathān villages are numerous to this day. As instances, Qasūr near

¹ H. W. Bellew, *Inquiry* (1891), p. 206.

Lāhor, numerous villages between Dihlī and Ambālah, the town of Jalālābād, the city of Farrukhābād, and other places in the Jamnah—Ganges *Dūābah*, also many villages and towns in Rohilkhand, come to mind at once. But the Afghāns, in spite of their numbers and their hold on the land, hardly played any part in the political history of the day until 'Alī Muḥammad Khān, Dāūdzaī, established himself as a ruler in Bareilī and Ānwalah, and Muḥammad Khān, Bangash did the same in Farrukhābād. But, after the fifteen years' rule of Sher Shāh and his successors (1540–1555), the Afghāns were much prized as valiant soldiers. Their weakness was too great love of money, and too great a readiness to desert one employer for another, if he made a higher bid. They were too rough and illiterate to obtain much distinction in civil life. It is said that during Shāhjahān's reign (1627–1658), Afghāns were discouraged and employed as seldom as possible. It was not until 'Ālamgīr began his campaign in the Dakhin (1681–1707) that they again found favour, those nobles who had Afghān soldiers receiving the most consideration.¹

Other foreigners, serving in small numbers in the Mughal service, were the Arabs, Ḥabshīs, Rūmīs, and Farangīs. As soldiers these men were found almost entirely in the artillery. Arabs were, of course, from Arabia itself; Ḥabshīs² came from Africa, mostly negroes; Rūmīs were Mahomedans from Constantinople or elsewhere in the Turkish empire; Farangī, that is Frank, was the name of any European. Eunuchs were generally of Ḥabshi race, and the chief police officer of Dihlī was frequently a Ḥabshi. There were some Frank, or Farangī, physicians; one of the name of Martin, or Martīn Khān, probably a Frenchman, died at Dihlī about the middle of the eighteenth century, after living there for many years.

In opposition to the Mughal or foreign, was the home-born or Hindūstānī party. It was made up of Mahomedans born in India, many of them descended in the second or third generation from foreign immigrants. Men like the Sayyads of Bārḥah, for instance, whose ancestors had settled in India many generations before, came, of course, under the description of Hindūstānī or *Hindūstān-zā* (Indian-born). To this class also belonged all the Rājput and Jāt chiefs, and other powerful Hindū landowners. Naturally, too, the very numerous and industrious body of Hindūs, who filled all the subordinate offices of a civil nature, attached themselves to the same side. Panjāb Khātris were very numerous in this official class; most of the rest were Āgarwāl

¹ Bhīm Sen, 173b.

² Ḥabsh is the name for Abyssinia, but the name Ḥabshī was used in a more general sense for all Africans.

Baniyās or Kāyaths. It also comprised many Mahomedans from Kashmir, who seem to have rivalled the Hindūs as secretaries and men of business.

Nor, in speaking of the Indian-born party, must we forget the subdivision among them due to the repugnance, even to this day so strongly shown, of Western Hindūstānis or Panjābīs to men from Eastern Hindūstān or Bengal. Crowds of men from Bengal had followed in Farrukhsīyar's train. *Khūshhāl* Cand, in an amusing outburst, declares that "God created the Pūrbiyah (man from the East) without shame, without faith, without kindness, without heart, malevolent, "niggardly, beggarly, cruel; ready to sell his children in the *bāzār* "on the smallest provocation; but to spend a penny, he thinks that a "crime equal to matricide." When they entered the imperial service, they required a signet-ring, but many tried to talk over the seal-cutters and get these for nothing. He admits that there were a few notable exceptions, but then as the saying is, "Neither is every woman a "woman, nor every man, a man; God has not made all five fingers the "same."¹

A cross-division, to which we must draw attention, as it is a most important one, was that into Emperor's friends and Wazir's friends. In the reign of Farrukhsīyar this was the most decisive of all distinctions. From almost the first day of the reign till the very last, we shall find the whole situation to turn upon it. A small number of private favourites, such as Mir Jumlah, *Khān* Daurān, and at a later stage, I'tiqād *Khān* (Mhd. Murād), formed a centre to which the other great nobles, each in turn, rallied, only to retire in disgust after a short experience of Farrukhsīyar's shiftiness and want of resolution.

¹ *Khūshhāl* Cand, 406.

Nah har zan, zan ast, o nah har mard, mard;
Khudā har panj angusht yaksān na kard.

On the above incident someone composed the lines—

Shakhse ba dūkān-i-saja' kan-i-dast tahī
Mīguft kih: "Āe! dalīl na būd o nahī!
'Khān' kandah ba-dah, muft, ba ism-am. Guftā:
'Jān' kandan bih, kaz in khijālat ba-rahī."

A man at the shop of a needy motto-cutter,
Said; "Here, neither argument nor denial,
"Cut *Khān* to my name for nothing." He replied;
"To cut *Jān* is better, and give up such shabby tricks."

The play is upon "*Jān kandan*," To engrave the word *جان*, *Jān*, instead of *خان*, *Khān*, also meaning "to give up the ghost."

SECTION 13. SEVERITIES INFLICTED AT THE INSTIGATION OF MİR JUMLAH
(MARCH 1713–APRIL 1714).

The opening of the reign was marked by many executions and other severities to men belonging to the defeated party, and such terror of strangulation spread among the nobles who had held office during the reigns of 'Ālamgīr and Bahādur Shāh, that every time they started for the audience, they took a formal farewell of their wives and children. The whole of these severities are attributed, and apparently with truth, to the influence of Mir Jumlah.¹ Although it involves a slight break in the chronological order, these events will be grouped together.

The first of these executions took place by Farrukhsīyar's orders during the night of the 2nd Rabi' I. 1125 H. (28th March, 1713). Sa'dullah Khān, son of 'Ināyat-ullah Khān, Kashmīrī, Hidāyat Kesh Khān, a Hindū convert, who had been central newswriter (*Waqā'i-nigār-i-kull*)² and Sidi Qāsim, Ḥabshī, late Kotwāl or Police officer of Dihli, were the victims. They were strangled by the Qalmāq Slaves (Sa'dullah Khān struggling with them till he was overpowered), and their bodies were exposed for three days on the sandy space below the citadel. It is difficult to decide what Sa'dullah Khān's crime had been. In the last year of Bahādur Shāh's reign he was deputy wazīr with the title of Wazārat Khān, and his temporary adhesion to Jahāudār Shāh was no worse crime in him than in many others who were pardoned. At first, Farrukhsīyar had received him with favour. But on the 21st Muḥarram 1125 H. (16th February, 1713), immediately after the Emperor had visited Pādshāh Begam, the sister of 'Ālamgīr, Sa'dullah Khān was sent to prison and his property confiscated. As to the reason for his disgrace, there are two versions, with both of which the name of Pādshāh Begam is mixed up. As told by Khāfi Khān, it would appear that a forged letter had been sent to Farrukhsīyar in the name of Pādshāh Begam asking for the removal of Sa'dullah Khān. The Begam is represented as having repudiated this letter, when Farrukhsīyar visited her *after* the execution of Sa'dullah Khān. But the only visit that is recorded took place a month *before* his execution.

The other version is that Farrukhsīyar had consulted Pādshāh Begam as to his conduct towards Asad Khan and Zū'lfiqār Khān. She wrote a reply counselling him not to deal severely with them, but to admit them to favour and maintain them in office. She made over the letter to

¹ Khāfi Khān, II., 732. Yahyā Khān, 121b, puts all these executions to the account of the two Sayyads. The *Aḥwāl-i-Khawāqīn*, 62a, names one 'Ashūr Khān as head of the executioners.

² His original name was Bholā Nāth, and he succeeded to the office on his father, Chatar Mall's, death in 1109 H., *Ma'āṣir-i-'A*, 396.

Sa'dullah Khān, who was her Mir-i-Sāmān, or steward. As he was strongly opposed to Zū'lfiqār Khān, owing to the quarrel about the appointment of a successor to Mun'im Khān, Bahādur Shāh's wazīr, and also hoped that a rival's removal would increase his own chance of becoming *wazīr* he extracted the real letter and substituted one of an entirely contrary effect, or, as one version says, altered the words "should not kill" (*na bāyad kusht*) into "should kill" (*bāyad kusht*). Pādshāh Begam reproached Farrukhsiyar for having taken Zū'lfiqār Khān's life. The Emperor pulled her letter out of his pocket and the substitution of the forged letter was thus discovered. Sa'dullah Khān was immediately arrested. This second story certainly appears the more probable of the two.¹

Hidāyat Kesh Khān's crime was that he had denounced to Jahāndār Shāh the hiding-place of Muḥammad Karīm, the new Emperor's brother, and thus indirectly led to that prince's life being taken. Some say that, in addition, he behaved in a harsh and insolent manner to him when he was made prisoner. No one knows what Sīdī Qāsim had done to deserve death, unless it be attributed to private revenge. As *faujdar* of some of the parganahs near Dihlī he had executed the son of a tradesman named Udhū. This man, thirsting for the *kotwāl*'s blood, levied a contribution of ten or twelve rupees on each shop in the quarters of Shāhganj and Shāhdarah. Having collected a very large sum, he paid it over to Mir Jumlah, and secured in exchange the arrest and execution of Sīdī Qāsim.²

The next cruelty was done on Sabhā Cand, the Hindū confidant of the late Zū'lfiqār Khān. On the 11th Jamādi II, 1125 H. (4th July 1713), he was made over to Mir Jumlah. The next day it was intimated to the Emperor that Sabhā Cand's tongue had been cut out, as a punishment for the foul language that he had constantly used. The strange thing was that after this deprivation he was still able to talk and make himself understood.³

After Sabhā Cand, came the turn of Shāh Quadratullah of Allahābād. His father, Shekh 'Abd-ul-Jalīl, was a man of learning of the Ṣūfī sect, who lived in Allahābād. On his death, Quadratullah succeeded to his influence and position, being himself a man of learning and considerable eloquence. Prince 'Azīm-ush-shān chanced to make Quadrat-

¹ *Tārīkh-i-Muzaffarī*, p. 155, Khūshhāl Cand 397b. There is a separate biography in M-ul-U II., 504. Sa'dullah Khān was the second son of 'Ināyatullah Khān, Kashmīrī. It is said in the *Makhzanu-l-gharāib* that he wrote under the name of Hidāyat. (Ethé, Bodleian Catalogue, No. 395).

² Khūshhāl Cand, 398a, Kāmwar Khān, 134, Khāfī Khān II., 735.

³ Khāfī Khān II., 735.

ullah's acquaintance, and took such a fancy to him that he could not bear him to be away from his side. Wherever the prince went, the Shekh accompanied him; and in the end, the Shekh became all-powerful. In the last years of Bahādur Shāh's reign all business passed through his second son's hands, and Quadratullah was that prince's right hand. It was as if the whole empire had fallen under his rule, even the wazīr and his sons asking him to plead for them. The refusal to appoint Zūlfiqār Khān to succeed Mun'im Khān and the appointment instead of a deputy, Hidāyatullah Khan (Sa'dullah Khān), were due to Shekh Quadratullah, although he had no official rank whatever. In the struggle for the throne his advice prevailed over that of all others. After 'Azim-ush-shān's death, the Shekh, fearing the resentment of Zūlfiqār Khān, hid himself and escaped secretly to his home at Allahābād. When Farrukhsiyar started for Agrah to confront Jahāndār Shāh, the Shekh, believing success to be utterly impossible, stayed quietly at home, not even coming to present his respects. After the victory had been won, the Shekh still hesitated to return to Court, since in his day of power he had conciliated no one, not even the sons of his patron. Then one Mulla Shādmān, a holy man of Patnah 'Azīmābād, passed through on his way to Dihlī. It is commonly asserted that this man had prophesied that Farrukhsiyar would gain the throne, and from this cause the Prince had acquired the greatest confidence in his powers. Quadratullah, thinking the Mullā's protection would be certain to secure him a favourable reception, joined his party and they travelled together to Dihlī.²

On reaching Dihlī, the Mullā was admitted to an audience and received with great cordiality. Assured of his own favour with the new Emperor, the Mullā arranged that at his second interview Quadratullah should accompany him. The Mullā passed on into the *Tasbīh Khānah* (chaplet-room or oratory), where the Emperor was, intending to mention Quadratullah's name and obtain leave to produce him. Mir Jumlah, who was with Farrukhsiyar, heard what the Mullā said. He had seen the extent of Quadratullah's power and influence in 'Azim-ush-shān's time, and he feared that this might be renewed in the case of the son. His own position would thus be destroyed. Taking hurried leave of the Emperor, he came to the door of the Privy Audience Hall,

¹ B.M. Or, 1690, fol. 165a, gives the 13th as the date. He was released on the 17th Jamādī II., 1126 H., at the request of Quṭb-ul-Mulk, after paying a fine of Rs. 100,000 (Kāmwar Khān, 147). Rāe Sābhā (or Sambhā) Cand, Khatri, died at Dihlī in the end of Jamādī I. 1137 H. (Jan.-Feb., 1725), aged nearly 70 years (*T-i-Mhdi.*)

² Mirzā Muḥammad, 181-186, Kāmwar Khān, 142, *T-i-Mhdi.*, Year 1125. H.

where the Shekh was seated, and gave him a most effusive greeting. He added that, just at that moment, His Majesty being deep in some very important business, a full audience, as such a friend was entitled to, would be impossible; it would be far better for the Shekh to accept for that night the hospitality of his old friend. Next day or the day after, a proper interview could be arranged. As Mir Jumlah at that time had the entire power of the realm in his own hands, the Shekh thought these blandishments of good augury, and fell in with his proposal. Forgetting all about his companion, Mullā Shādmān, he set off with Mir Jumlah, who put him in one of his own pālkis and carried him off to his house. That night and the next day Mir Jumlah was profuse in his attentions.

At the end of the day Mir Jumlah went to the Emperor. He said to him that it would be wrong to pardon the Shekh. The gentleman was a necromancer and by his incantations and jugglery had inveigled 'Azim-ush-shān into his net. By his rise all the nobles had been put out of heart, hence when Zulfikār Khān took the field, many would not bear a part, and the rest although pressed made no proper efforts. If Quadratullah gained the same acceptance here, he would cause mischief in every business. Since Farrukhsīyar looked on Mir Jumlah as Wisdom and Prudence personified, he gave a nod of assent. Mir Jumlah left the darbār at the usual time; and at midnight he gave orders to his men to hang the Shekh, in his presence, to a *maulsari* tree growing in the courtyard of his mansion.¹ Next morning, the 13th Zu'l qa'dah 1125 H. (30th November 1713), the Shekh's dead body was made over to his servants for burial. It is said that Mullā Shādmān remonstrated with Farrukhsīyar, saying that the man had done nothing to deserve death. Even if such acts were proved, Quadratullah and he having come to Court together, the Shekh's death would bring disgrace on him and throw doubt on his character. Farrukhsīyar was ready to admit all this, but as the deed was done, he made some excuses and tried to talk the Mullā over. But the Mullā declined to remain longer at Court, and returned to his home.²

Shortly after this time, Farrukhsīyar having quarrelled with the Sayyads, was afraid that they might bring forward some other prince of

¹ *Maulsari*, a tree (*Mimusops elengi*), the flowers of which are highly fragrant. (Shakespeare's Dictionary).

² Kāmwar Khān, 142, entry of 11th Zul qa'dah 1125 H. (2nd year) gives the facts with a slight variation. He says that Quadratullah, a *darvesh*, son of 'Abdul Jalil Allahābādī, having reached court presented an offering of one musk bag (*bakhūrah*). An order issued that he should be put up in the house of Mir Jumlah. On the 12th it was reported that Mir Jumlah had hung the man.

the house of Taimūr to take his place. But a prince once deprived of eyesight could not be raised to the throne. The Emperor resolved, therefore, to deprive of their eyesight the more prominent and more energetic of the many scions of the house of Taimūr held in captivity in the palace. On the 6th Muḥarram 1126 H. (21st January, 1714), three of the princes, A'zzu-d-dīn, eldest son of Jahāndār Shāh, 'Alā Tabār,¹ son of A'zam Shāh, and Farrukhsīyar's own younger brother, Humāyūn Bakht (then only ten or twelve years old), were removed from the palace to the prison at the Tirpoliyah or Triple gate. It was the place where Jahāndār Shāh's life had been taken, and where in a few years' time Farrukhsīyar himself was to suffer the same fate. A needle was passed through the eyes of the three princes, and they were thus rendered incapable of ever becoming rivals for the throne. Mir Jumlah is credited with having been the man who urged Farrukhsīyar to carry out this harsh act.²

Finally, on the 2nd Rabī' II, 1126 H. (16th April, 1714), the Qalmāq woman, Shādmān, entitled Rāe Mān, a servant in the palace, was made over to Sarbarāh Khān, the kotwal or Chief of the Police, and her head was cut off at the *Chabūtrah*,³ or central police-station. Her crime was that, during the reign of Jahāndār Shāh, one of her relatives had drawn his sword on Mir Jumlah. Rāe Mān is the woman who gave the alarm when an attempt was made to assassinate Jahāndār Shāh;⁴ she bravely attacked the assailants and slew one of them with her own hand. For this good service she had received the titles of Razā Bahādur, Rustam-i-Hind, and the rank of 5,000 *zāt*.⁵

Although not mentioned in the general histories, the humoristic poet, Sayyad Muḥammad Ja'far of Nārnol, poetically Zataḷī, is said to have been one of the victims. His crime is said to have been a satirical

¹ *Wālā Tabār* in *Khāfī Khān*. 11., 740.

² A chronogram was made for it :

*Shāh-i-'ālam, ba aghwāe-i-shayātīn,
Kashīdah mīl dar cashm-i-salātīn (1126 H).*

“ The lord of the world, at the instigation of devils,
Passed a needle through the eyes of the princes.”

Wārid, 150b, Kāmwar Khān, p, 144, 'Khāfī Khān II, 740.

³ *Chabūtrah* means a platform of earth or masonry raised slightly above the surface of the ground. This name was given to the office of the head police officer of Dihlī; it was situated in the Chāndnī Cauk, the main street leading from the Lāhor gate of the city to the Lāhor gate of the citadel.

⁴ See Journal, Vol. LXV (1896), p. 147.

⁵ Kāmwar Khān, 146, Mīrzā Muḥammad, 187.

parody of the distich on Farrukhsiyar's coinage. The details will be given when we come to speak of the coinage of the reign.¹

SECTION 14. FIRST QUARREL WITH THE SAYYADS (APRIL 1713).

The story as told by Yaḥyā Khān, Farrukhsiyar's Mir Munshī, is that at the enthronement 'Abdullah Khān demanded the post of *wazīr* for himself. Farrukhsiyar made the objection that he had given his word to Ghāzī-ud-dīn Khān (*i.e.*, Ahmad Beg, Ghālib Jang), a promise which he could not break. 'Abdullah Khān might retain all power under the name of *Wakīl-i-Muṭlaq* or vicegerent. 'Abdullah Khān said there had been no *Wakīl-i-Muṭlaq* since Jahāngīr's reign, except when Bahādur Shāh gave that office to Asad Khān. But the two cases were not parallel; he had won the crown for Farrukhsiyar by his own sword and his own right hand, therefore his title to be *wazīr* was indisputable. Farrukhsiyar thought it best to give way, as he had only newly succeeded and was not yet secure on the throne. In this version of the facts, the only certain point is the supersession of Ghāzī-ud-dīn Khān, Ghālib Jang: but there is no sufficient reason to believe that Farrukhsiyar was, in any way, a reluctant participator in the new arrangement, although as soon as he had appointed 'Abdullah Khān, he appears to have repented of it.²

As we have seen, a few days after the victory at Agrah, Quṭb-ul-Mulk was detached to seize Dihlī; and, for the moment, the second brother, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān, was incapacitated by severe wounds from taking any active part in affairs. The opportunity was too good to be lost. Farrukhsiyar was never long of the same mind and fell always under the influence of the last speaker. Mir Jumlah, Khān Daurān, Taqarrub Khān, and other personal friends and favourites found thus a splendid opening for intrigue, of which they at once availed themselves. Between the departure of Quṭb-ul-Mulk for Dihlī and Farrukhsiyar's own arrival at the capital barely a month elapsed; but this short interval was sufficient to implant in Farrukhsiyar's mind the seeds of suspicion, and he arrived at Dihlī already estranged from the two Sayyads. We have told how the Court party interfered between the Sayyads and Zu'lfiqār Khān, beguiling the latter

¹ *Malāḥat-i-maqāl*, fol. 74a. Beale, p. 186, says Ezad Bakhsh, Razā, was also executed, but as he died in 1119 H. (Rieu, Index, p. 1157), this must be a mistake. The *Tārīkh-i-Muḥammadī*, a very accurate work, gives Ezad Bakhsh's death at Akbarābād under 1119 H., and says he was son of Āqā Mullā, son of Zain-ul-'Abidain, son of Āṣaf Khān, Ja'far, the Ṣadiqī, the Qazwīnī, *alias* the Akbarābādī. An account of this Āṣaf Khān is in *Ma, āṣir-ul-umarā* I., 113.

² Yaḥyā Khān, 122a.

to his destruction. These intrigues had not remained altogether concealed from Husain 'Alī Khān, and in the most secret manner he communicated his suspicions to his brother. He wrote, we are told, that on his brother's leaving the camp it was clear, from the Prince's talk and the nature of his acts, that he was a man who paid no regard to claims for service performed, one void of faith, a breaker of his word, and altogether without shame. Thus it was necessary for them to act in their own interests without regard to the plans of the new sovereign. If Husain 'Alī Khān really wrote these words, at such an early stage of his acquaintance with Farrukhsīyar, it proves him to have possessed wonderful penetration and great insight into character. The remainder of our story yields abundant evidence of the fact that the character of Farrukhsīyar could hardly be delineated with greater accuracy than in the above words. Acting on his brother's hint, 'Abdullah Khān, as a precaution, assumed possession of the house lately occupied by Kokaltāsh Khān, Jahāndār Shāh's foster-brother, and with it all the cash and property contained therein.

For a couple of weeks after Farrukhsīyar's entry into Dihli, the appearance of amity was preserved. But the weapons of discord lay in abundance ready to hand. The disputes that now began raged round two things: The nominations to office, and the appropriation of the confiscated wealth of the Jahāndār Shāhī nobles. A third lever for persuading Farrukhsīyar to get rid of the two Sayyads was found in his superstitious fears.

When 'Abdullah Khān reached Dillī in advance of the Emperor, he took upon himself to promise the post of *Dīwān* of the *Khālīṣah*, or Exchequer Office, to Luṭfullah Khān, Ṣādiq, and that of *Ṣadr-uṣ-Ṣudūr*, or Head of the Religious Endowments, to the former holder, Sayyad Amjad Khān.¹ On the march from Āgrah, Farrukhsīyar gave these offices to his own followers; Chhabīlah Rām, Nāgar, receiving the *Dīwānī* of the *Khālīṣah*,² and Afzal Khān, who had taught Farrukhsīyar to read the Qurān, being made Ṣadr. Over these conflicting orders a quarrel broke out directly the Emperor reached Dihli. 'Abdullah Khān, Quṭb-ul-Mulk, fell into a passion, and said that if his very first exercise of power was contested, what was the object of being wazir? Mīr Jumlah and other favourites did their best to inflame the wound by remarking that when a sovereign deputed power to a minister, it was for

¹ Amjad Khān's original name was Bū 'Alī; he was Bakhshī and Wāqī'ah Nigār of Dihli at the time of 'Ālamgīr's death and was made Ṣadr by Bahādur Shāh.—*Khūshhāl Cand*, 376a.

² Chhabīlah Rām's appointment was made on the 17th Zūl Hījāh, Kāmwar Khān, 127.

the minister to recognise the limits of that power, and not make appointments to high office without sanction. A compromise was at last arrived at; Luṭfullah Khān retained the *Dīwanī* and Afzal Khān, the *Ṣadārat* with the titles of Ṣadr Jahān. Chbabilah Rām was consoled with the Government of Āgrah.¹

Owing to the violent change of government, there were naturally many confiscated mansions at the disposal of the crown. Two of these with their contents were conferred on Quṭb-ul-Mulk and his brother. One known as Ja'far Khān's, which Kokaltāsh Khān, Khān Jahān, had held, was given to Quṭb-ul-Mulk; and another called Shāistah Khān's, recently in the possession of Zū'lfīqār Khān, was made over to Ḥusain 'Alī Khān. As soon as the distribution had been made, Farrukhsīyar's private circle of friends poured into his ear suggestions that these two mansions contained untold treasures, the accumulated wealth of many generations. In them was stored, they said, the property which had belonged to the four sons of Bahādur Shāh, and the whole revenues of Hindūstān for a year past. All this had now fallen into the possession of the two Sayyads. On the other hand, the imperial treasury had been emptied and the palace denuded of everything to pay Jahāndār Shāh's soldiers.²

Superstition was even more powerfully brought into play. It was a superstitious country and a superstitious age; and Farrukhsīyar was as much subject to these influences as any of his contemporaries. A prophesy had been made, which met with the widest acceptance, that after Bahādur Shāh's death his youngest descendant would reign. He would, in his turn, be followed by a Sayyad. Talk about this became so common that soon everyone had heard it. Of course, it was at once urged on the Emperor that the Sayyad who was to reign could be no other than one of the two brothers. Acting on the principle that dropping water wears away a stone,³ they repeated this story over and over again to Farrukhsīyar, till it had the effect of making him openly show ill-feeling to the two Sayyad brothers.⁴

The quarrel had proceeded so far by the beginning of Rabī 'I. (27th March 1713), that Quṭb-ul-Mulk ceased to attend the daily audience, an infallible sign that a noble had a grievance or was out of

¹ Mhd. Qāsim, 171. Afzal Khān died at Dihlī in the end of Rabī 'II. or early in Jamādī I, 1138 H. (January 1726), Rank 5000—*T-i-Mhdī.*, Khāfi Khān II, 729, 731.

² Kāmwar Khān, 132, Wārid, 149a.

³ The Persian saying is *Hezam kashān*, 'ālam soz, "Go on gathering firewood, and you can burn the world."

⁴ Wārid, 149a.

humour. Farrukhsiyar was always ready to take any step, however humiliating, which might for the moment postpone decisive action and give him time to plan some fresh treachery. Accordingly, on the 9th Rabi 'I. (4th April 1713), on his way back from Wazirābād, a place on the banks of the Jamnah, where he had gone to hunt, he paid a visit to Quṭb-ul-Mulk's house and embraced him affectionately. He deigned to eat his breakfast and take his midday sleep there before returning to the palace. Quṭb-ul-Mulk, in return for so much condescension, made many costly gifts to His Majesty, receiving others in return. This is noted as the first public disclosure of the ill-feeling between the Emperor and his minister, which went on increasing year by year till it ended in catastrophe.¹

SECTION 15. CAMPAIGN AGAINST RĀJAH AJĪT SINGH RĀHTOR
(NOV. 1713—JULY 1714).

As we have already explained, the Rājput states had been for fifty years in veiled revolt from the Imperial authority. Bahādur Shāh had been unable, owing to more pressing affairs, to reduce the Rājahs effectually. During the confusion which arose on that monarch's death, Ajit Singh, after forbidding cow-killing and the call for prayer from the 'Ālamgiri mosque, besides ejecting the imperial officers from Jodhpur and destroying their houses, had entered the imperial territory and taken possession of Ajmer. Early in Farrukhsiyar's reign it was determined that this encroachment must be put an end to; and as the Rājah's replies to the imperial orders were not satisfactory, it was necessary to march against him.²

At first it was intended that the Emperor in person should take the field, but he was dissuaded on the ground that his dignity would suffer if the rebel fled into the desert, where there was nothing but sand to feed upon. Nor does the Emperor appear to have been in particularly good health.³ Husain 'Alī Khān was therefore appointed, Ṣamṣām-ud-daulah receiving charge of his seal as his deputy at Court. The plots against the Sayyads were still being carried on in Farrukhsiyar's

¹ Kāmwar Khān, 134, Wārid, 149b.

² Khāfi Khān II, 738. *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 69b. According to Tod, II., 82, the Rājah had been called on to send in his son, Abhai Singh, but had refused. Instead, he sent men to Dihlī to assassinate one Mukand, his enemy. This outrage produced the invasion of Jodhpur. Probably this Mukand is the same as Mulkan of Mairtha on p. 75 of the same volume.

³ Farrukhsiyar was ill from the 1st Zūl Hījjah 1125 H. (18th December 1713), but was better on the 9th (26th December), and to stop rumours, he appeared at the Jama' Masjid on the 'Id i.e., the 10th. His bathing after recovery took place on the 22nd (8th January 1714).—Kāmwar Khān, 143.

entourage, and the plotters hoped that by separating the brothers the task of overthrowing them would be rendered easier. There were also the chances and dangers of a campaign to be counted on in their favour. On this occasion we hear for the first time of a plan which was adopted very frequently in this reign and afterwards. Official orders were given in one sense, and the opposing side received secret letters of a different purport, assuring them of future favour if they made a vigorous defence and defeated the imperial general sent against them. Letters were despatched to Rājah Ajit Singh urging him to make away with Husain 'Alī Khān in any way he could, whereupon the whole of the Bakhshī's property and treasure would become his; and he would, in addition, receive other rewards.¹

Husain 'Alī Khān's audience of leave-taking was granted on the 29th Zū, 1 Qa'dah (16th December 1713), and his advance tents left Dihli on the 20th Zū, 1 Hijjah 1125 H. (6th January 1714). The generals under him were Sarbuland Khān, Afrasyāh Khān, I'tiqād Khān (grandson of Shāistah Khān, deceased), Dildaler Khān, Saif-ud-dīn 'Alī Khān, Najm-ud-dīn 'Alī Khān, Asadullah Khān, Sayyad Shujā'at-ullah Khān, Sayyad Husain Khān, Sayyad Khān, Azīz Khān, Rohelah, Caghtā, Bahādur, Shākīr Khān, Ghulām 'Alī Khān, Rājah Udwant Singh, Bundelah, Rājah Gopāl Singh, Bhādauriyah, Rājah Rāj Bahādur of Rūpnagar and others. From the imperial magazines there were delivered to him 500 *mans* of powder and lead, 200 rockets, 100 *mahtāb*, and five cannon. Although a letter had been received from the Rājah on the 15th Zū, 1 Hijjah 1125 H. (1st January 1714), the contents not being of a satisfactory nature, the preparations were not suspended and the advance began. Then Raghunāth, a *munshī* in the service of Ajit Singh, came to Sarāe Sahal, escorted by one thousand horsemen, with a view to negotiation.² Husain 'Alī Khān was then at Sarāe Allahwirdī Khān. He rejected the terms offered and sent on his tents from Sarāe Sahal.³

On the march thieves gave much trouble. The general caused a ditch to be dug round the camp each time a halt was made, and Mewātī watchman were placed outside it on guard. Once two Mīnā thieves were caught, and next morning were blown from guns. This severity scared the marauders away. In parganah Rīwā'ī and the villages on the road there were splendid standing crops. At first these were des-

¹ Kāmwar Khān, 142, entry of 13th Zū, 1 Qa'dah 1125 H. (2nd December, 1713) *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 70a, Shiū Dās, p. 36.

² The *Tuḥfat-ul-Hind* of Lāl Rām, B.M. Nos. 6583, 6584, folio 88b, gives the date 14th Muḥarram (1126) = 29th January, 1714.

³ Kāmwar Khān, 142, B.M. 1690, folio 166a.

troyed by the camp followers. But to prevent this plundering, petty officers were placed on duty; next day several men were caught red-handed and brought in bound. They were paraded through the camp, seated on donkeys with their faces to the tail and arrows in their ears and noses. By this means the injury to the crops was put an end to.¹

The Rāhtor army was reported to be twelve kos south of Sāmbhar;² rumour said they were hiding in ambush and intended to molest the imperialists while on the march. Not a trace of them, however, was seen between the capital and Ājmer; and as the imperial army passed through parganah Sāmbhar it destroyed Ṣanamgarh, a place of worship which had been erected at great cost. The march was conducted under great difficulties, the army suffering much in those sandy deserts from the want of water, in spite of the fact that they carried a provision of it along with them. On reaching Ājmer the camp was pitched for some days on the banks of the lake Anasāgar,³ whence messengers were sent to the Rājah, on the principle that "Peace is better than War."⁴ After a time the Sayyad moved on to Puhkar,⁵ five miles north-west of Ājmer and thence to Mairtha, about forty miles further on, in Jodhpur territory; but Ajīt Singh still fled before him further into the sandy desert. An armed post (*thānah*) of two thousand men was placed in the town of Mairtha.⁶

In the country round Ājmer and between that place and Mairtha, the villages of Rājah Ajīt Singh and those of Jai Singh of Amber are intermingled. The inhabitants of the Jodhpur villages were afraid and took to flight. Thereupon orders were issued to plunder and burn down all villages found uninhabited, but to leave all others unmolested. When this became known, the Jodhpur villages interceded through their Jaipur neighbours; their plundered goods were then restored, the only loss being of the houses that had been burned. The country was thus settled and brought under imperial rule, step by step, as the army moved forward. 'Abu-ṣ-Ṣamad Khān, who had been recalled from the Panjāb, joined at Puhkar, but at the very first interview he and the Sayyad disagreed.⁷

On the way to Mairtha, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān called a council of war,

¹ Kām Rāj, 55a.

² Thornton, 852, on the south bank of the Sāmbhar Lake, about 175 m. S.-W. of Dihlī; Rājputānah Gazetteer, II, 159, 39 m. S.-W. of Jaipur.

³ Rājputānah Gazetteer, II, 4 and 61.

⁴ *Kāre kih bah ṣulah bar-nayāyad,*
Dīwanagī dar ū mī-bāyad.

⁵ Thornton, 771 (Pokur), and Rājputānah Gazetteer, II, 67: Thornton, 618 (Mirta), 76 m. N.-E. of Jodhpur; (Mirta), Rājputānah Gazetteer, II, 261.

⁶ Kām Rāj., 55a, Mhd. Qāsim, 197, *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 71.

⁷ *Ma, āṣiru-l-U I*, 321. *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 71b, 72a.

and proposed that in spite of the approach of the hot weather, stores of water should be collected and the advance continued. Ajit Singh, he asserted, must either be taken and his head sent to Court, or his son surrendered as a hostage and his daughter offered as a bride to the Emperor. Others advised delay, and much apprehension prevailed. The difficulties were many, the great heat of the sun, the deficiency of water, the high prices, the want of grain and grass for the cattle. In spite of all these, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān resolved to leave most of his baggage behind and make a forced march on Jodhpur.¹

The conclusion of the campaign was soon announced at Court by a report received on the 14th Rabi 'I, 1126 H. (29th March 1714). It appeared that Ajit Singh had retreated in one night from his position south of Sāmbhar and had fallen back on Mairtha, and without making any stand there had gone on to Jodhpur, where he had hoped to be safe, surrounded by the desert. Finding that the Sayyad was still pressing onwards and seemed determined to strike a blow at him in spite of the inaccessibility of his capital, he sent his women and children into places of safety in the hill country, and himself sought refuge in the deserts of Bikāner.² Evidently he felt himself too weak to meet the imperialists in the open field, and during the time that Sayyad Miyān, the Bakhshī's father, was governor of Ājmer, the Rājputs had learned respect for Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's qualities as a general. When Ḥusain 'Alī Khān was within 30 miles of Mairtha, an embassy arrived from the Rājah, escorted by fifteen hundred horsemen.³ It was believed that their arrival was a mere subterfuge, devised in order to gain time for the Rājah to escape. In order to make sure of them, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān told them that if they were in earnest, they must agree to be put in fetters. After objecting to this proposal, as involving infamy and disgrace, they consented. Four of the principal men were put in chains. Directly they made their appearance from the Audience tent in this condition, the loose characters of the imperial camp assumed

¹ Kām Rāj, 55b, *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 72a.

² Tod, II., 82, says Ajit Singh sent off the men of wealth to Sewanoh and his son and family to the desert of Razdarroh, west of the Loni river. This Razdarroh may be the Raus or Rass of Thornton, 820, a town on the N.-W. declivity of the Aravalli range, 38 m. W. of Naṣīrābād, Lat. 26° 17', Long. 74° 16'. Sewanoh is possibly the Sewarra of Thornton, 876, 27 m. S.-W. by S. of Jodhpur, 42 m. N. of Dīсах, Lat. 24° 50', Long. 72°.

³ Khūshḥāl Cand, 401b, says that Ajit Singh asked Jai Singh of Amber for advice, and was recommended to make terms. Is this at all likely? According to Tod, II, 82, the terms were asked for by the advice of Ajit Singh's *dīwāns*, and still more of Kesar, the bard, who adduced a precedent of the time when Daulat Khān, Lodi, had invaded Mārwar.

that the envoys' overtures had been rejected. A body of them rushed at once to the Rājput tents, attacked their guards, and plundered all their property. There was great difficulty in suppressing this disorder. The envoys were sent for, their chains removed, and full apologies made. The envoys themselves were satisfied and continued the negotiation, but news of the outbreak having reached the Rājah, he fled. Ḥusain 'Alī Khān was thus forced to advance to Mairtha, where he halted until the terms of peace had been arranged.¹

The terms were that the Rājah should give one of his daughters in marriage to the Emperor, in the mode which they styled *Dolah*,² that the Rājah's son, Abhai Singh, should accompany Ḥusain 'Alī Khān to court, and that the Rājah in person should attend when summoned.³ Zafar Khān (Roshan-ud-daulah) arrived at Court on the 5th Jamādī I 1126 H. (18th May, 1714), with the news. Ḥusain 'Alī Khān sent the greater part of his army back to Dihlī, and remained for two months in Ājmer, restoring the country to order. On the 26th Jamādī II 1126 H. (8th June, 1714), it had been reported that he was at Puhkar, west of Ājmer, on his way back from Mairtha. On the return march, owing to the great heat, they moved at night and halted in the day. On the 2nd Rajab (13th July, 1714), he arrived at Sarāe Allahwirdī Khān. On the 5th he was presented to the Emperor, being received with great outward cordiality, and the commanders who had served under him were richly rewarded. Zafar Khān was honoured with the special title of *Fidwī-i-Farmānbardār*, "the loyal and order-obeying servant." Kuṅwar Abhai Singh's audience took place three days afterwards (19th July, 1714), with all fitting ceremony.⁴

SECTION 16.—RENEWAL OF OPEN QUARREL WITH THE SAYYADS.

During Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's absence, Mir Jumlah's power had gone on increasing. Farrukhsīyar had made over his seal to this favourite, and was often heard to say openly: "the word and seal of Mir Jumlah are the word and seal of Farrukhsīyar." On his side, Quṭb-ul-Mulk was immersed in pleasure and found little or no leisure to devote to state

¹ Kāmwar Khān, 195, Khafī Khān, II, 738, *Ma, āṣir-ul-U*. I, 321, Muḥammad Qāsim, 190.

² *Dolah*, a Hindī word for an informal marriage. *Tawārīkh-i-Mārwar* of Murārī Dās, Vol. 2, fol. 80b, states that the girl's Hindū name was Bāe Indar Kunwar.

³ Tod II, 82, Abhai Singh was recalled from Razdurroh and marched to Delhī with Ḥusain 'Alī Khān at the end of Asārh 1770. The last day of that month equals 28th June, 1713, or if the southern reckoning be followed, it then falls in 1714 (17th June, 1714).

⁴ Tod II, 82, says Abhai Singh was made a Panj Hazārī (5,000): Kāmwar Khān 146, Wārid, fol. 150b, Kām Rāj., 56a.

affairs. Nor, being a soldier who had come into office without much preparation for civil affairs, was he very competent to deal with the details of administration, for which, moreover, he had no natural taste. Everything was left to his man of business, Ratn Cand, a Hindū of the Baniyā caste, and a native of a village near the Sayyads' home at Jānsath.¹ He had been recently created a Rājah with the rank of 2,000 *zāt*. The chief dispute centred upon the question of appointments to office, the fees paid by those receiving appointments being a recognised and most substantial source of emolument. Ratn Cand, in addition to these customary fees, exacted large sums, which were practically bribes or payments for the grant of the appointment. By Mir Jumlah's independent action in bringing forward candidates and affixing the seal to their warrants of appointment, without following the usual routine of passing them through the wazīr's office, the emoluments of both the chief minister and of his head officer were considerably curtailed. It is a matter of little wonder, therefore, that Quṭb-ul-Mulk felt aggrieved at the unusual powers placed in the hands of a rival such as Mir Jumlah. This noble was much more accessible than the wazīr, and was not given to the extortionate practices of Ratn Cand. Naturally, men in search of employment or promotion sought his audience-hall rather than that of Quṭb-ul-Mulk. The wazīr suffered, in this way, both in influence and in income. Moreover, Mir Jumlah allowed no opportunity to pass without depreciating the Sayyad brothers, and brought forward arguments of every sort to prove that they were unfitted for the offices that they held.²

The quarrel which had broken out in the first weeks of the reign was patched up in the manner already recounted. But no thorough reconciliation had been effected; nor, considering the character of Farrukhsiyar, was any such reconciliation to be expected. The Sayyad brothers could never be certain from day to day that some new plot was

¹ My old acquaintance, Rāe Bahādūr Nihāl Chand, Āgarwāl, an Honorary Magistrate of Muzaffarnagar, in a letter of the 1st Dec., 1893, informs me that Ratn Cand was a native of Jānsath town, where he had built a handsome house, now in a ruined state, but still in the hands of his impoverished descendants. He belonged to a sub-caste of the Āgarwāls called *Rājah-kī-barādarī* (*i.e.*, the Rājah's relations), the reference being to Rājah Agar Sen, the reputed founder of the caste, their ancestor having been that Rājah's son by a concubine. The epithet of *Baqqāl* (shop-keeper) attached to Ratn Cand's name, is the Persian version of the vernacular caste name *Baniyā* or *Muhajan* (trader). None of these words necessarily implies that Ratn Cand had ever kept a shop; they are the name of his caste. Many Baniyās by caste may still be found in the employ of the State, in all grades.

² *Khāfi Khān* IIa, 739, *Khūshhāl Cand*, 399a.

not being hatched for their destruction. The Rājputānah campaign was the means of unmasking one of these schemes. Secret letters had been, as we have already mentioned, despatched to Rājah Ajit Singh, urging him to strenuous resistance, and inviting him, if he could, to make away with Ḥusain 'Alī Khān. These letters came into Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's possession and through them he acquired proof of Farrukhsīyar's double-faced dealings. There are two stories of the manner in which this happened. One, told by Wārid, is that when Rājah Ajit Singh was hardpressed and saw no other way out of the danger, he sent in the original letters for the perusal of the Sayyad. Ḥusain 'Alī Khān at once entered into negotiations for a peace, in order that he might return to Court without delay to defend his own and his brother's interests. The other version is, that the Rājah made the letters over to his daughter when she started for Court, and that either on the journey or after her arrival at Dihlī, when staying in the mansion of the Sayyad, the documents were in some way got at and their contents ascertained. In the interval of Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's absence, Quṭb-ul-Mulk had found the greatest difficulty in maintaining his position at Court. All the power was in the hands of Mir Jumlah. Every day messages came from Farrukhsīyar, couched in various forms, but all urging him to resign the office of wazīr. Quṭb-ul-Mulk now wrote letters to his brother enjoining him to return to Dihli with all possible speed. In response to these calls, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān, as we have seen, reached the capital again on the 5th Rajab 1126 H. (16th July, 1714).¹

For the next two or three months the breach between the Emperor and the minister, although far from closed, was not sensibly widened. The Sayyads, as was natural, looked on Farrukhsīyar's accession to the throne as the work of their hands, and resented the grant of any share of power to other persons. On the other hand, the small group of Farrukhsīyar's intimates, men who had known him from his childhood and stood on the most familiar terms with him, were aggrieved at their exclusion from a share in the spoil. They felt that they themselves were not strong enough to attack the Sayyads openly; and recourse to other nobles of wealth or experience would do no more than substitute one set of masters for another. Their plan, therefore, was to work upon the weak-minded Farrukhsīyar." "The Sayyads," they said to him, "look upon you as their creation, and think nothing of you or your power. They hold the two chief civil and military offices, their relations and friends have the principal other offices, and the most profitable land assignments (*jāgīrs*). Their power will go on increasing, until, should they enter on treasonable projects, there will be no one able

¹ Wārid, fol. 150a, 150b, Seir I, 80-81, Seir text, 23.

“to resist them. It would be better to reduce their strength in time. For this purpose, two nobles of position should be brought to the front and placed on an equality with them.” If the Sayyads gave way, all would be well; the object sought would have been accomplished. But should they, with the rashness (*jahālat*) for which the Bār̄hah Sayyads were famous, resist the undermining of their power, then the two nobles could oppose force to force. But open fighting should be resorted to only in the last extremity. The two brothers should be caught when unattended and made prisoners, as had been done with Zūlfīqār Khān, and if necessary, despatched as he had been.¹

Farrukhsīyar, a man of no wisdom, accepted this advice as the perfection of right reasoning, the acme of loyalty to his person. The two men selected to confront the Sayyads were Khān Daurān and Mīr Jumlah. They were both promoted to the rank of 7,000 horse: they were placed, the former at the head of 5,000 *Wālā shāhī*, and the latter of 5,000 Mughal troopers. Many of their relations were pushed forward into high rank, and counting these men's troops, each of the two nobles had at his command over ten thousand men. Among the signs of this favouritism was the order passed on the 12th Sha'bān (2nd Sept., 1713), permitting Mīr Jumlah to entertain 6,000 horsemen, who were to be specially paid from the imperial treasury. These were raised by Amānat Khān, his adopted son, from Mughals born in India, and some seventy lakhs of rupees for their pay were disbursed from the treasury, the rules as to descriptive rolls of the men and branding of the horses being set aside. No order was issued by Farrukhsīyar without the advice and approval of the above two men. In this exercise of authority Mīr Jumlah assumed the lead, till at length Quṭb-ul-Mulk was only the nominal, while he was the real wazīr. The two Sayyads bowed for the time to the Emperor's will, and made no opposition to these usurpations. At length, through the indiscretion of some palace servants, the Sayyads learnt of the plots against their life.² They ceased to appear in darbar and shut themselves up in their houses,

¹ Mirzā Muḥammad, 189.

² Or as some say, they were informed by a message from Farrukhsīyar's mother, who considered herself bound by the promises made to the Sayyads at Paṭnah. (Khāfī Khān II, 740). One authority (*Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 77b) makes Luṭfullah Khān, Ṣādiq, the informant. He is described as “unrivalled in deceit, professing devotion to the sovereign, and yet as thick as could be with the Sayyads.” He sent word to the latter privately that he had been present one night in Farrukhsīyar's audience-chamber, when, at the instigation of Mīr Jumlah and Khān Daurān, the Emperor had spoken harshly of them. There was no time for writing at length; one word was as good as a volume. Let them refrain from attending Court; or if they did attend, let them be very cautious.

taking every possible precaution against a surprise. The Emperor's desire to ruin them became a matter of public rumour, although, when appealed to, the nobles and confidants of the Emperor strenuously denied its truth.¹

At length, in Zū, 1 Qa'dah 1126 H. (7th Nov.—6th Dec., 1714), a son having been born to Ḥusain 'Alī Khān, he resolved, as the custom was, to present a gift to His Majesty and ask him to name the child. At this time Farrukhsīyar was out on a hunting expedition and his camp was in a grove not far from the city.² When the Nawāb reached the Privy Audience Hall, finding the Emperor still in the chapel tent, he took a seat. While he was waiting, a number of his friends confided to him the secret that on that day it was intended to lay violent hands upon him. A number of men were hid in ambush. The Nawāb felt his last hour had come and prepared to meet his fate. When his arrival was reported to Farrukhsīyar, an order was sent out for him to come to the oratory.³ The Nawāb betrayed no fear, but walked towards the tent. When the door-keeper, following the rules of the palace, requested him to lay aside his arms, he became inwardly apprehensive and said: "Very well, as it is not convenient to receive me just now, I will make my bow another time." Report of this hesitation was taken to Farrukhsīyar, who came out, staff in hand, and stood outside the chapel tent, and received the Nawāb's obeisance there, and replying with some silly, unmeaning compliments, dismissed him to his home. But the countenance of Farrukhsīyar betrayed the real anger and vexation under which he was labouring from the non-success of his plans to seize the Nawāb.⁴

When he reached his house, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān wrote to the Emperor to the following effect. It was quite clear that distrust of his brother and himself had found entrance into the Emperor's mind, and he was resolved on their overthrow. In that case, what could they do but submit to orders? But honour was a thing dearer than life; they might fall, but in so doing, they would take care not to sacrifice their honour. Let them be removed from rank and office, with leave to return to their homes and there offer their prayers for His Majesty's welfare. On reading the letter Farrukhsīyar took fright and returned to the city at once, in the hope of procuring some reconciliation. It so happened that soon after he reached the palace, a letter arrived from Quṭb-ul-Mulk to the same effect. Farrukhsīyar's equanimity was still further upset. From

¹ Mirzā Muḥammad, 190, Kāmwar Khān, 139.

² The Bāgh of Muḥsin Khān is named in Khāfi Khān II, 739.

³ *Tasbīḥ Khānah*, literally "chapel-room."

⁴ Mirzā Muḥammad, 191, Wārid, 150b, 151a.

this time, the two Sayyads gave up attendance at darbar, and persisted in demanding the acceptance of their resignation of rank and office. Meanwhile they fortified their houses, and after Farrukhsīyar's return to the palace, negotiations went on for nine days. Among the messages they sent was one asking for a grant of several lakhs of *dāms*, payable from the country round their home, to which they would retire; or they offered to recover Balkh and Badakhshān, which might be given them in *jāgīr* if they were successful. On the other hand, if they failed they would have earned a name which would survive until the Day of Judgment. If this request, too, was refused, let the plotters against them appear and fight them on the sands of the Jamnah below the palace windows (*jharokah*), the Emperor becoming spectator and umpire. Power would belong to the survivors. To all these importunities the Emperor's answer was that no plot against them was in existence.¹

The conspirators told the Emperor that as the Sayyads were strongly supported by a large army and a numerous following of relations and adherents, their only object in offering to resign was to secure an unopposed withdrawal from the city, where they saw that it was impossible to carry out a successful revolt. Once in their home country, they would be certain to break out into rebellion. From this stage, the quarrel having become public, concealment was no longer possible and the principal nobles were called into consultation by Farrukhsīyar. Finally it was resolved not to interfere openly with the Sayyads, but to appoint a new wazīr, in the hope that their adherents would fall away from them. Most of these had resorted to them with the object of obtaining assignments on the land revenue. Deserted, as they probably would be, by these men, their party would be weakened and their consequence would gradually diminish.

It is said that the leader in giving this advice was Mnhammad Amīn Khān, I'timād-ud-daulah. His idea was that, since in length of service, nobility of family, fertility of resource, and ability as a soldier, there was in his opinion no one his equal or rival, the Emperor's choice must fall upon him. And it is quite likely that, if he had been supported and given authority to act, he could have carried the affair to a successful termination. But the Emperor's advisers foresaw that if the present danger were overcome through his aid, and their first enemies removed out of their way, to get rid afterwards of the victor would be a still more arduous enterprize than the one at present before them. They preferred that Mir Jumlah should receive the robes of *Dīwān* and assume the office of chief minister. Now, as a contemporary writer remarks, Mir Jumlah and Khān Daurān "were only carpet knights

¹ Kām Rāj, 53b, Mirzā Muḥammad, 193.

“(*sher-i-qālīn*) and not true fighters (*mard-i-maidān*). They talked “well, but evaded dealing with the kernel (*maghẓ*) of the matter.” Mir Jumlah, having no real strength of character, knew that he was not fitted to enter the lists as a champion to fight the Sayyads. He therefore made excuses and drew on one side. Who, then, was “to bell the cat”? There remained Khān Daurān. He was in reality a mere braggadacio, a big talker of the kind supposed to be the peculiar product of Hindūstān;¹ and he was frightened lest he should ever be called on to take the lead, and lose his life in the attempt to destroy the Sayyads. Therefore he went secretly to Farrukhsīyar and suggested as the best course that Muḥammad Amīn Khān should be propitiated in every way, and the control of the affair confided to him. When it had been concluded and the Sayyads destroyed, he could be removed from office before he had time to consolidate his power. Overtures ought to be made to him²

Muḥammad Amīn Khān, who had learnt the inmost secrets of the plot, and was also disheartened by the shifting moods of Farrukhsīyar, was far from ready to accept the office. He said that he had no wish to be wazīr; he was a plain soldier unaccustomed to such duties. If fighting men were wanted and the Emperor would head the troops in person, he would perform the obligations of a loyal servant and give his life for his master. But in the absence of His Majesty, his own troops and those of his relations were unequal to an attack on the Sayyads. The imperial and *Wālā Shāhī* troops had been warned for service under him; but he had no proof of their fighting quality. How could he feel any confidence in them? Besides, they were all of them near death's door from poverty and hunger, having neither good horses nor effective arms. In the *Wālā Shāhī* corps they had enlisted many townsmen, who neither respected others nor were themselves respected. Indeed, many lowcaste men and mere artisans held commands. He could not rely on such troops. Finding this lack of zeal among his partisans, Farrukhsīyar began to lose heart. The men of the *Haft Caukī*, or personal guard, were ordered into the palace; and the unity and firm resolve of the Sayyads having been fully ascertained, it was decided to resume friendly relations with them.

While all these schemes were in progress, the Sayyads stopped at home and were never seen at *darbār*. Crowds of their dependents and

¹ R. F. Burton “Book of the Sword,” 108, note 4, applies to the Indians the lines:

“for profound

“And solid lying much renowned.”

² Mirzā Muḥammad, 194, *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 77b.

flatterers continued to attend their audiences. But soon it became known that the Emperor had made up his mind to destroy them, and had transferred the office of wazīr to another. By slow degrees the daily crowd of suppliants grew less and less. Nay, some of the very Bārḥah Sayyads absented themselves, and the two brothers and their adherents fell into great perplexity. If things had gone on like this for three or four days longer, they would have been much reduced in strength: in another week or ten days, the Emperor's end would have been gained. But it was not long before the truth leaked out, as to the differences among his advisers, the want of heart in his troops, and the state of alarm into which he had himself fallen. Once more the Sayyads' mart resumed its former briskness, and the throng at their doors became greater than before.

The Emperor ordered Islām Khān, Mashhadī, formerly head of the artillery, to point some cannon at Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's mansion, and kill him if possible. This order was not obeyed; and on Mir Jumlah's complaint, Islām Khān was sent for. That officer excused himself on the plea of the risk to innocent neighbours, and asked what fault the Sayyad had committed. Farrukhsīyar began to complain of them. Islām Khān then offered his services as intermediary. Having visited them and expressed to them the Emperor's grievances, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān began with a denial of having thwarted the Emperor in the least. He continued: "The words of the truthful, though somewhat bitter, yield pleasant fruit. As S'adī of Shirāz says:

' Each good deed has its reward, each fault its penalty.¹

"If they were in fault, let the Emperor himself say so; why should a multitude suffer for the crimes of two men; their heads were there, ready for His Majesty's sword. By God Most High! since they were real Sayyads, no word of reproach would escape their lips:—

We turn not our heads from the sword of the enemy,
Whatever falls on our head is our Destiny."²

This talk frightened Islām Khān so much that he soon asked for leave to go. He hurried back to Farrukhsīyar, and worked on the Emperor's mind till his views were changed. Islām Khān then suggested: "Why not send for them"? and he offered to bring them. Farrukhsīyar said: "Good, I also wish it." Islām Khān reported to the Sayyads that the Emperor had turned round and would like to see them. Ḥusain 'Alī Khān met this by the objection that though they

¹ *Har 'aml ajr, o har gunāh jazāe dārad.*

² *Sar na gardānem az tegh-i-janīb,
Har cah āyad bar sar-i-man ba nasīb.*

were loyal, they could not go to Court while Mir Jumlah was there; but they were willing to go on active service. Why should they remain at Court when there was no real but only apparent friendship. "Service and submission are from the heart, not from the tongue."¹

Farrukhsiyar, who was much cast down at the refusal of his friends to act, followed up this negotiation with further attempts to conciliate the Sayyads and offers of doing their will, swearing many oaths that he would never attempt to injure them again. Khwājah Ja'far, the holy man, an elder brother of Khān Daurān, Sayyad Husain Khān, Bārḥah, Sayyad Shujā'at Khān and others, went to and fro repeatedly. At these interviews the Sayyads expatiated, as usual, on their good services and the devotion they had shown, diversified by loud complaints of the Emperor's ingratitude. At length they said that they were convinced that the flames of illwill had been set alight by the efforts of Mir Jumlah and Khān Daurān. So long as those two gentlemen were left at Court they did not feel justified in presenting themselves there, for they would still be afraid of renewed attack. But Khwājah Ja'far succeeded in overcoming their objection to Khān Daurān. He entered into a solemn covenant on his brother's behalf, that he would never again act towards the Sayyads contrary to the rules of true friendship. Should the Emperor entertain any such project, he would hinder its execution to the best of his ability. If unsuccessful, he would at once warn the Sayyads. On these terms Khān Daurān was forgiven. Mir Jumlah was thus left to meet the brunt of their displeasure, and they insisted on his dismissal from Court.² It was about this time that two of the Sayyads' uncles, Sayyad Khān Jahān and Asadullah Khān, counselled them to retire from Court. Quṭb-ul-Mulk objected that they were unfit for a saintly, recluse life. Khān Jahān explained that he did not counsel retirement from the world, but retirement from Court. "Say to the Emperor that you do not wish to remain at Court, that soldiers such as you are cannot manage the duties of a *wazīr* or a *bakhshī*; let him send one of you to Bengal, the other to the Dakhin." The brothers thought the proposal a good one, but feared that it would be misrepresented by their enemies. Sayyad Khān Jahān asked, "How so"? They replied that they would be accused of meditating independence. Then another idea was brought forward. Why should they not, in order to obtain the removal of Mir Jumlah, propose that one of the two brothers leave Court at the same time as Mir Jumlah. All present approved, and a request to this effect was sent to the Emperor through I'tibār Khān, a eunuch. Strangely

¹ *Aḥwāl-i. khawāqīn*, 88a to 91b.

² Mirzā Muḥammad, 198.

enough Farrukhsiyar had conceived a similar plan, and therefore the offer was at once accepted.¹

As Farrukhsiyar was by this time in a great fright and held it of the first importance to come to some settlement, he now consented gladly to all their demands. On the 22nd Zūl Qa'dah 1126 H. (28th November, 1714), the Emperor's mother visited the house of Quṭb-ul-Mulk and on her son's behalf renewed his promises, binding herself by oaths in the most solemn form. On the next day Quṭb-ul-Mulk with all his retinue repaired to the palace. Mir Jumlah and Khān Daurān advanced as far as the door of the Public Audience Hall to receive him. The Nawāb reproached them to their faces in the severest language. But the two cowards swallowed the bitter draught as if it had been composed of sugar and honey. Not a word of answer issued from their lips. The Emperor was seated at the window in the Hall of Justice, when Quṭb-ul-Mulk came in, followed by forty to fifty of his most trusty veterans. His Majesty embraced him affectionately and entered into many excuses for his own doings, the tears standing in his eyes the while. Quṭb-ul-Mulk also wept, and recounted at length his own and his brother's many acts of loyalty and self-sacrifice, ending with asserations of their unalterable devotion. Then, in accordance with the demands of the Sayyads, it was agreed that Mir Jumlah should be despatched to *Ṣūbah Bahār*; while Luṭfullah Khān, Ṣādiq, who furnished all the brains that Mir Jumlah had, and was believed by the brothers to be at the root of all the mischief, was deprived of his rank. His mansion and gardens were confiscated, but on the request of Quṭb-ul-Mulk, the rest of his property was left to him. On the 5th Zūl Ḥijjah 1126 H. (11th December, 1714), Mir Jumlah was conducted to Lāhor in the charge of two mace-bearers.²

On the day appointed for their attendance, just before the Sayyads were received in audience, Luṭfullah Khān Ṣādiq, with effusive signs of joy, had met them in the middle of the great court in front of the public audience chamber, and began to sound their praises like a hired flatterer. "During their absence the Court, even at noon-tide, had been "plunged in the darkness of a long winter night, it seemed as if with "them the sun and moon had disappeared" and more in the same strain. Quṭb-ul-Mulk retorted roughly: "What is the use of all this "fulsome talk; if you meant it in your heart, why did you not show it "in acts and try to heal the breach"? Luṭfullah Khān then informed them that he had noticed a change in the Emperor's purpose, and believed that mischief was intended, for this reason only had he now

¹ *Aḥwāl-i-khawāqīn*, 93b.

² Mirzā Muḥammad, 199, Kāmwar Khān, 151, has 23rd—Wārid, 151a.

troubled them. Having planted the seeds of distrust in their hearts, he hurried back to the Emperor and said that from what he had seen, he expected the Sayyads would use force. Farrukhsiyar broke out into anger: "The better I treat these men, the worse they oppose me." Additional guards were posted at the doors. After the usual ceremonies, Qutb-ul-Mulk stepped forward and protested their loyalty, and prayed that tale-bearers might no longer be listened to. For instance, a person trusted by His Majesty had just met them in the open court of the Audience Hall, and professing to be their friend, had told them that His Majesty meant to treat them harshly. If His Majesty thought them worthy of punishment, let him execute them with his own hand; and they would be happy to become a sacrifice. Farrukhsiyar retorted that a man had just told him the Sayyads intended to use force. The Sayyads rejoined that till one of these men was punished, things would never resume their proper course. The Emperor demanded the same. Explanations followed; this double treachery was brought home to the culprit, and the incident was the principal cause of Luṭfullah Khān's sudden disgrace.¹

As Nawāb Husain 'Alī Khān would not come to court until Mir Jumlah had left, the latter received his audience of dismissal on the 'Īd-uz-ḡuḡā (16th December, 1714). Four days afterwards (20th December, 1714), Husain 'Alī Khān entered the palace with his men, observing the same precautions as in the case of Qutb-ul-Mulk. The Emperor and the Mir Bakhshī exchanged compliments, under which their real sentiments were easily perceived. Some months before this time (12th Ramazān, 1126 H.—20th September, 1714) Husain 'Alī Khān had obtained in his own favour a grant of the Dakhin *Ṣūbahs*, in super-

¹ *Aḡwāl-i-khawāqīm*, 72a.

The following pungent chronogram is given by Khūshḡāl Cand (404a), who evidently disliked Luṭfullah Khān very much:—

*Ai! ba-bin 'z āh-i-khalq Luṭfullah
Az bulandī 'ftādah dar tah-i-cāh;
Sāl-i-tārīkh az Khīrad justam:
Guft Hātīf kih, "Radd shud badkhwāh" (1126).*

"Oh! Behold, through the cries of the people, Luṭfullah has fallen from a lofty place into a deep well; I sought the date from Wisdom. An angel spoke: "The wisher of evil was cast out."

Luṭfullah Khān went to his home at Pānīpat, where Mirzā Muḡammad paid him a visit on the 9th Ṣafar 1131 H. (28th Dec., 1718), when passing through on his way from Dihlī to Rāhūn in the Jālandhar *dūābah* (Mirzā Muḡammad, 420). Dakhnī Khānum, the Emperor's maternal aunt, entered on possession of Luṭfullah's confiscated mansion.

session of Nizām-ul-Mulk. He had then no intention of proceeding there in person, but meant to exercise the government through a deputy, Dāūd Khān, as had been done by Zūlfiqār Khān, after fixing the amount of profit to be remitted to him every year. It was now proposed that he should leave Court and take over charge of the Dakhin himself. Owing to fears for his brother's safety and other reasons, he had been very reluctant to leave Dihli. At length, under pressure of circumstances, he consented to take his departure to the South, Khān Daurān Ṣamṣām-ud-daulah being appointed his deputy at Court. One writer¹ ascribes this change of plan to Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's disgust with recent events. It should rather be looked on as part of the agreement under which Mir Jumlah was sent away.²

On the 17th Zūl Hижah (3rd December, 1714), after his own troops had taken charge of the palace gates, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's audience of leave-taking took place; but his first march to Nizām-ud-dīn Auliyā's tomb was postponed till the 29th Ṣafar (5th March), and his actual departure was not reported till the 30th Rabī' I 1127 H. (4th April, 1715), when he set out by way of Ājmer. At this last audience he had made the significant remark that if in his absence, Mir Jumlah were recalled, or his brother were subjected to annoyance, his return to Court might be looked for within twenty days from the occurrence of either event. He took with him power to appoint and remove all officials and exchange the commanders of all forts in the Dakhin. Nay, a common story is that, under compulsion, Farrukhsiyar made over to him the great seal, in order that the warrants of appointment to the forts should not require imperial confirmation. The settlement of these various matters had caused a delay of three or four months, which were spent by Ḥusain 'Alī Khān at Bārahpulāh.³ Hardly was Ḥusain 'Alī Khān's back turned before new schemes were contrived, and on the 29th Jumādī I (3rd May, 1715), Dāūd Khān, then Governor at Ahmadābād in Gujarāt, was reappointed to Burhānpur, one of the *Ṣūbahs* under charge of Ḥusain 'Alī Khān. Dāūd Khān received secret instructions from the Court to resist the Mir Bakhshī to the best of his ability, and if possible to kill him. The reward promised him was succession to the six *Ṣūbahs* of the Dakhin. When we come to relate events in the various provinces during this reign, we shall return to the subject. Suffice it to say here that, much to the chagrin of the Court party, Dāūd Khān was killed in battle near Burhānpur on the 8th Ramazān 1127 H. (6th September, 1715),

¹ Mirzā Muḥammad, 202.

² Khāfi Khān, II, 741.

³ Mirzā Muḥammad, India Office Library, MS. No. 50, foll. 128b, Khāfi Khān, II, 742.

and Ḥusain 'Alī Khān was victorious. In the same way, Mir Jumlah's doings at Paṭnah will be told hereafter.¹

SECTION 17.—FARRUKHŚIYAR'S MARRIAGE TO AJĪT SINGH'S DAUGHTER
(MAY–DECEMBER 1715).

Owing to his anxiety to return at once to Court, Ḥusain 'Alī Khān had not been able to wait in Rājputānah, until Rājah Ajīt Singh had finished the necessary preparations for the despatch of his daughter to Dihlī. When the dispute with the Sayyads had been allayed and Ḥusain 'Alī Khān had taken his departure for the Dakhin, Shāistab Khān, the Emperor's maternal uncle, was sent on the 12th Jamādī I 1127 H. (15th May, 1715) to bring the bride from her home at Jodhpur. He arrived with her at Dihlī on the 25th Ramaḡān 1127 H. (23rd September, 1715), and tents were erected within the palace for her reception. She was then sent to the mansion of Amīr-ul-Umarā, and the preparations for the wedding were made over to Quṭb-ul-Mulk. Four days afterwards the Emperor repaired to the mansion of Amīr-ul-Umarā, and there on repetition of the creed, the lady was admitted into the Mahomedan faith. The same night the marriage rite was performed by Shariyat Khān, the chief Qāzī, one lakh of gold coins² being entered in the deed as her dower. The nobles presented their congratulations, and the Qāzī received a present of Rs. 2,000).³

The bridegroom's gifts to the bride⁴ were provided on a regal scale by the Emperor's mother, and sent to the bride's quarters on the 15th Zū, l Ḥijjah (11th December, 1715), accompanied by many nobles, who were entertained by Quṭb-ul-Mulk. On the 20th the ceremony of applying henna to the bridegroom's hands and feet carried out, and the persons who brought it were entertained in the usual way.⁵ On the 21st (17th December, 1715), the whole of the Dīwān-i-'Ām and the courtyard (*Jilau Khānah*), both sides of the road within the palace, and the plain towards the Jamnah were illuminated by lamps placed on bamboo screens. About nine o'clock in the evening, Farrukhsīyar came out by the Dihlī

¹ Kāmwar Khān,—Report of battle received 10th Shawwāl, 1127 H. (8th October, 1715).

² *Ashrafī*, a gold coin worth 16 rupees.

³ Mirzā Muḡammad, 212, Kāmwar Khān, 156, 158.

⁴ These were called the *Sāchaq*, a Turkī word. Mirzā Muḡammad tried to get into the palace of Quṭb-ul-Mulk as a spectator, but the crowd was so great that he was forced to come away. In the Orme Collections, p. 1697, Surman's diary says: "December 1st. Great preparations made for the King's marriage with the Ranny that arrived some time ago." December 1st, Old Style = December 12th, New Style.

⁵ Mirzā Muḡammad, I. O. Library, No. 50, fol. 132a. For *Hinnā bandan*, *Mahndī bandan*, see Herklot's "Qanoon e-Islam," p. 68.

gate of the palace, seated on a moveable throne and wearing, according to usage, the clothes sent to him by the bride's father, of which Khemsī, Bhandāri, had been the bearer. The Emperor was preceded by platforms, on which stood women singing and dancing as they were carried along. Fireworks were let off.¹ The Emperor entered the house of Amīr-ul-Umarā and there completed the usual ceremonies. Those observed on this occasion were a mixture of Mahomedan and Hindū usages. One which caused much remark was the offer to the guest of a drink made of rose-water, sugar, and opium. This mixture was pressed on them by the Rajputs on the plea that it was the custom of their country. Many Mahomedans drank of it, but some objected. There was another thing never seen before in an imperial wedding. A gold plate had been made with five divisions, and each of these divisions was filled with precious stones. In one, diamonds; in another, rubies; in the third, emeralds; in the fourth, topazes; and in the fifth, which was in the centre of them all, large and valuable pearls.² Farrukhsīyar returned late at night, bringing the bride with him to the palace, which he entered by the Lāhor gate, it being unlucky to go and come by the same route. The festivities continued to the end of the month.³

The consummation of the marriage had been delayed for a month or two by Farrukhsīyar's illness. When he returned to Dihlī on the 19th Sha'bān (19th August, 1715), he was suffering from hæmorrhoids. It was on this occasion that the services of William Hamilton, the English surgeon, were called into requisition. He had accompanied an embassy sent to Dihlī to complain of the conduct of Murshid Qulī Khān, Nāẓim of Bengal, in regard to the re-imposition of the custom duties which had been remitted by 'Ālamgīr.⁴ By the 16th October

¹ Mirzā Muḥammad and his brother were present in the procession, on foot. They went with it from the Dīwān-i-'Ām to the house of Amīr-ul-Umarā, M.M., 219.

² Yahyā, 122b, *Khūshḥāl Cand*, 402a.

³ *Taghaiyyar-i-rāh dādan*; not to return by the way or gate by which you went, a practice observed by the Emperors of Hindūstan (*Mirātu-l-iṣṭilāḥ*). Mir 'Abd-ul-Jalīl, Bilgrāmī, wrote a long *maṣnavī*, or narrative poem, in honour of the occasion. (Lithographed at Nawal Kishor Press, Lakhnau, 1299 H.) Mr. Beale praises it for the skill with which the Hindū names of the planets are introduced under the guise of Persian words. (*Miftāḥ*, 301). The chronogram of Mḥd. Aḥsan, Ma'nī Khān (Ijād), was:—

From the garden of Mahārājah Jaswant Singh
A flower came to the secret chambers of the palace.
Zi bāgh-i-Mahārājah Jaswant Singh

Ba muṣḥkbūe daulat darāmad gule (1127). *Miftāḥ*, 302, Mirzā Muḥammad, 213-14, Kāmwar Khān, and Wheeler, 178.

⁴ J. T. Wheeler, "Early Records," 169-184.

(N.S.), the Emperor had been for some time under treatment by Mr. Hamilton. His ailments are said in the envoy's letters to have been first swellings in the groin and then a threatened fistula. This account agrees closely with the contemporary writer, Kāmwar Khān's, statement.¹ On the 3rd, Farrukhsiyar bathed on his recovery, and on the 10th December the surgeon was publicly presented with valuable gifts. As to this mission we shall give further details in a future section.

SECTION 18.—FIGHT BETWEEN THE RETAINERS OF MUHAMMAD AMĪN KHĀN AND OF KHĀN DAURĀN (APRIL 1st, 1716).

As an illustration of the disorder and want of discipline prevailing, even when the Emperor was present, among the large bodies of troops maintained by the chief nobles, we will here recount a fight which took place between the men of Muḥammad Amīn Khān and those of Khān Daurān. On the 6th Rabī' II 1128 H. (29th March, 1716), Farrukhsiyar started for one of his numerous hunting expeditions to Siūli, a preserve near Sonpat and about 20 miles north of Dihlī. On the 26th (18th April, 1716), he returned to Āgharābād, just north of the city, and pitched his camp near the garden of Shālihmar. Three days afterwards (21st April, 1716), Mirzā Muḥammad rode out from the city in the morning, and after paying some visits, alighted at the tents of Sa'dullah Khān, where he ate his breakfast and took a sleep. Near the time of afternoon prayer (*zūhar*), at less than three hours to sunset, as he was preparing to go home, he heard the sound of cannon and musketry fire. The men of Muḥammad Amīn Khān and of Khān Daurān had begun to fight. The contest went on for over an hour, and as Mirzā Muḥammad was riding home, he met crowds of armed men, who were hurrying from the city to take a part in the affray, the majority being retainers of Muḥammad Amīn Khān, most of whose men had gone into the city, whereas Khān Daurān's were still with him. Opposite the Surkh-sangī or red-stone Mosque, Qamr-ud-dīn Khān, son of Muḥammad Amīn Khān, was encountered, galloping at the head of some men to his father's aid. During the night word was brought into the city that by Farrukhsiyar's orders, Amīn-ud-dīn Khān and others had parted the combatants and settled the dispute. The origin of the affair was this. Muḥammad Amīn Khān's retinue was returning from the audience to their own tents at the time Khān

¹ *O cūn dar īn ayyām nāsūre dar a'zāe safalī-i-Bādshāh-i-daurān āriz shudah būd* . . . "as in those days a gangrene had established itself in the ignoble parts of the reigning Emperor" . . . Kāmwar Khān's date for the gifts is the 14th Zūl, Qa'dah (10th Nov., 1715). The English Envoy (on July 7th, 1715), calls the ailment bluntly "buboes," Orme Coll., p. 1695.

Daurān's wife was on her road from the city. The two *cortèges* met, and in passing each other there was some confusion and hustling. As soon as Khān Daurān's men had escorted the Begam to her destination, they returned in a body and attacked Muḥammad Amin Khān's baggage. The few guards resisted, and a bow and arrow and matchlock fight continued for about one and a half hours. One Nāmdār Khān and several soldiers lost their lives; many of the bāzār followers also being killed and wounded. The Emperor reduced both nobles 1,000 *zāt* in rank, and the *faujdārī* of Murādābād was taken from Muḥammad Amin Khān and conferred on Amin-ud-din Khān. For two or three days neither noble would come to darbār. Then Farrukhsiyar wrote a note to Khān Daurān and sent I' timād Khān, a eunuch, to bring Muḥammad Amin Khān. A reconciliation was effected between the two men; and after their arrival in the city, they entertained each other in turn as a sign of renewed friendship.¹

Authorities quoted (in addition to those named in Vol. LXIII, pp. 112-114, Vol. LXV, pp. 210-212, and Vol. LXVII, pp. 103-104).

Printed Books (European Languages.)

1. *Thornton*—Gazetteer, 1 Vol., 1857.
2. *G. A. Herklots*—Qanoone Islam (Madras Reprint), 1863.
3. *J. T. Wheeler*—Early Records—1878.
4. *Rajputanah Gazetteer*, 3 Vols., 1879-80.
5. *R. F. Burton*—Book of the Sword, 1884.
6. *H. W. Bellew*, Races of Afghanistan, 1891.

Lithographed Books (Persian).

1. Maṣnavi of 'Abd-ul-jalīl, Bilgrāmī (Lakhnau, Nawal Kishor Press), 1299 H.

Persian and Hindi Manuscripts.

1. Bhīm Sen—*Tārīkh-i-dilkushā*,—British Museum, Oriental MSS., No. 28 (1120 H.)
2. *Tuhfat-ul-Hind*—by Lāl Rām, B. M. Addl. MSS. No 6583, 6584. (1148 H.)
3. *Malāḥat-i-Maqāl*—By Rāo Dalpat Singh, B.M. Or., No. 1828 (1181 H.)
4. *Tārīkh-i-Muzaffarī*—By Muḥammād 'Alī Khān (my copy) (1225 H.)
5. *Tawārīkh-i-Mārwar* (in Hindī)—By Murāī Dās, B.M. Or. 5839 (1879?)

¹ Kāmwar Khān, p. 163, Mirzā Muḥammad, 260, Wheeler 182, Khushḥāl Cand, 404a, 405b.
